

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030375US1
Serial No. 10/645,180
Response to Office Action mailed December 11, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 12 2007

III. REMARKS

1. Objections to the Specification.

The examiner objected to the specification for "failing to provide proper antecedent basis for "computer usable medium" The last paragraph of the specification (page 14, line 21 to page 14, line 5) has been amended to add the following:

In addition, those skilled in the art will realize that the above described invention may be embodied in a computer program product stored on a computer usable medium.

3. Double Patenting.

The examiner provisionally rejected claims 1, 14, and 27 for double patenting over co-pending application 10/645,200. Applicant submits that claims 1, 14, and 27 have been amended herein. In addition, the claims of co-pending application 10/645, 200 will be amended. Applicant believes that after the amendments in both applications have been entered, that the double patenting rejection will be moot.

4. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). The examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-9, 13-16, 18-22, 26-30, 32-36, and 40 as being anticipated by Tuli (US 6,941,382).

Applicant has amended each independent claim to add the limitation that:

wherein if the fragment contains a segmented hyperlink image, and if the user clicks on the fragment, then an image map instructs the browser to go to a second web page indicated by the web page hyperlink so that a user is directed to the second web page even if the web page hyperlink had been fragmented.

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030375US1
Serial No. 10/645,180
Response to Office Action mailed December 11, 2006


Applicant has further amended the claims to support the above limitation. Support in the specification for the amendments can be found on page 3, line 23 to page 4, line 2; page 8, line 21; and page 9, line 15 to page 10, line 15.

5. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The examiner rejected claims 4, 10-12, 17, 23-25, 31, and 37-39 are rejected as being unpatentable over Tuli.

Applicant submits that these claims now depend from allowable independent claims.

6. Applicant submits that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Rudolf O. Siegesmund
Registration No. 37,720
Gordon & Rees LLP
Suite 2650
2100 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75201
214-461-4050
214-461-4053 (fax)
rsiegesmund@gordonrees.com

Page 11 of 11